## Message

From: Davis, Eva [Davis.Eva@epa.gov]

**Sent**: 2/24/2016 7:36:15 PM

**To**: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. [dAlmeida.Carolyn@epa.gov]

Subject: RE: 2016-2-23 - wafb - ST012 - is EPA satisfied that regulators are on same page with ST012 SEE shut down or

extension

I'll call you about 3:30 -

From: d'Almeida, Carolyn K.

Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 1:33 PM

To: Davis, Eva <Davis.Eva@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: 2016-2-23 - wafb - ST012 - is EPA satisfied that regulators are on same page with ST012 SEE shut down or

extension

Eva

I'm available right now, for the next half hour until noon, then available again about  $1:30\,$  PST  $\,3:30\,$  your time

Teleworking 707 552-0948

From: Davis, Eva

Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 11:28 AM

To: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. <dAlmeida.Carolyn@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: 2016-2-23 - wafb - ST012 - is EPA satisfied that regulators are on same page with ST012 SEE shut down or

extension

Hi Carolyn – do you have time to talk this week? I've had an interesting conversation about ST-12 that I want to share with you - Eva

From: d'Almeida, Carolyn K.

Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2016 4:57 PM

To: Davis, Eva < Davis. Eva@epa.gov>; Wayne Miller < Miller. Wayne@azdeq.gov>

Cc: Dan Pope < DPope@css-dynamac.com>

Subject: RE: 2016-2-23 - wafb - ST012 - is EPA satisfied that regulators are on same page with ST012 SEE shut down or

extension

I have been reading and rereading the EBR sections of the RDRAWP to see where it is indicated that sulfate can degrade NAPL. The only statement I found was:

Benzene	100 to 500	Concentration	Benzene concentrations in extracted
concentrations:	μg/L	range where	groundwater provide an indication of the
		natural	amount of benzene remaining in the TTZ.
		attenuation can	These concentrations will be monitored
		complete	against a target benzene concentration in the
		degradation	100 to 500 μg/L range within the TTZ. This
		within the	concentration range is predicted to achieve
		remedy time	cleanup levels within the 20-year remedial
		frame.	timeframe based on modeling of groundwater
			contaminant attenuation outside the TTZs
			after active EBR (Appendix E). Benzene
			located around the perimeter of the TTZ and
			the perimeter/interior extraction wells will be
			evaluated for benzene concentrations to
			identify any perimeter influx that may mask
			benzene removal within the TTZ. It is
			expected that lower benzene concentrations
			within this range will be achieved in the
			interior of the TTZs than at the perimeter.
A4	046 057 060	B. B	8 4 3 4 4 L F D M O O C 7 D O O M L L E L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L

Yet on the call last week Don stated that 500 ppb concentration was the target goal for MNA only, without EBR. But it doesn't say that at all. Did you find the sections he was referring to? Sometimes I just feel like he is making stuff up to confuse us.

It also doesn't say in the RDRAWP that benzene concentrations are secondary to meeting target temperatures. It only says the primary factors (the first to be observed) would be achieving target temperatures and seeing mass removal rates decrease, and the remainder of the text seems to indicated that all criteria are equally weighted.

From: Davis, Eva

Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2016 11:45 AM

To: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. <dAlmeida.Carolyn@epa.gov>; Wayne Miller <Miller.Wayne@azdeq.gov>

Cc: Dan Pope <DPope@css-dynamac.com>

Subject: RE: 2016-2-23 - wafb - ST012 - is EPA satisfied that regulators are on same page with ST012 SEE shut down or

extension

I too am not convinced that they have gotten all they can from the steam. Was looking at the vapor phase data from the last data submission – TPH as JP-4 on 1/11/2016 was 13M ug/m3 – still an order of magnitude greater than what it was back in 10/2014. Confirms some of what Bo was saying that vapor phase extraction has not diminished. Also, based on the exhausting conversation we had last week, I'm not sure their response to comments are going to be fully acceptable, which is why I sent additional comments – as cryptic and informal as they were – last week. I think they should at least continue until we have the meeting in March when we'll hopefully have better discussions on this.

From: d'Almeida, Carolyn K.

Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2016 1:14 PM
To: Wayne Miller < Miller. Wayne@azdeq.gov>

Cc: Davis, Eva <Davis.Eva@epa.gov>; Dan Pope <DPope@css-dynamac.com>

**Subject:** RE: 2016-2-23 - wafb - ST012 - is EPA satisfied that regulators are on same page with ST012 SEE shut down or extension

## Wayne

I am a little concerned that Amec might shut down steam before we even have written responses to our comments on the EBR workplan in hand. The call last week was pretty exhausting. I'm not sure what more we can say at this point until we have the call to go over the next round of data from pressurization to compare. I am not convinced that continuing steam at this point would be less productive than starting EBR. But understand this is being run according to budget more than anything else. Perhaps we could do a joint letter stating that we don't approve SEE shutdown before the EBR workplan is approved? And get management to sign it?

## Carolyn

From: Wayne Miller [mailto:Miller.Wayne@azdeq.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2016 10:32 AM

To: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. <dAlmeida.Carolyn@epa.gov>

Subject: 2016-2-23 - wafb - ST012 - is EPA satisfied that regulators are on same page with ST012 SEE shut down or

extension

Do ADEQ and EPA need to issue a joint agency, simple single page statement/letter saying extend the SEE or SEE okay to shut down, or are we all waiting until after  $1^{st}$  call on Feb. 29 or after the  $2^{nd}$  call on March 8? Do EPA and ADEQ need to have a pre-meet before the  $29^{th}$ ?

Wayne Miller Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Waste Programs Division, Remedial Projects Section, Federal Projects Unit

Email: Miller.wayne@azdeq.gov

Phone: 602.771.4121

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, 1110 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007

NOTICE: This e-mail (and any attachments) may contain PRIVILEGED OR CONFIDENTIAL information and is intended only for the use of the specific individual(s) to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged and confidential under state and federal law. This information may be used or disclosed only in accordance with law, and you may be subject to penalties under law for improper use or further disclosure of the information in this e-mail and its attachments. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the person named above by reply e-mail, and then delete the original e-mail. Thank you.